			_	_		S DISTRICT COURT OF VERMONT
UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERICA)	
	VS)	CASE NO: 5:18-cr-61-1
SAM BENT)		
)	SENTENCING HEARING

BEFORE: HONORABLE GEOFFREY W. CRAWFORD

CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES: MICHAEL DRESCHER, ESQUIRE

Assistant U.S. Attorney

P.O. Box 570

Burlington, Vermont 05402 Representing The Government

STEPHANIE M. GREENLESS, ESQUIRE

Kaplan and Kaplan

P.O. Box 405

Burlington, Vermont 05402 Representing The Defendant

DATE: August 2, 2019

TRANSCRIBED BY: Anne Marie Henry, RPR
Official Court Stenographer
P.O. Box 1932
Brattleboro, Vermont 05302

```
(The Court opened at 10:30 a.m.)
 1
 2
               THE CLERK: Your Honor, the matter before the
 3
     Court is criminal number 18-61, United States of America
 4
     versus Sam Bent. Present on behalf of the government is
 5
     Assistant United States Attorney Michael Drescher.
 6
     defendant is present with his attorney, Stephanie Greenless.
 7
     And we are here for sentencing.
               THE COURT: All right. Morning. Good to see
 8
 9
     everybody.
10
              MS. GREENLESS: Good morning.
11
              MR. DRESCHER: Good morning.
12
               THE COURT: Let me start by reviewing everything
13
     I've received and make sure I've got everything you
14
     submitted. I have the Pre-Sentence Report, of course.
15
    memo from the defense with a letter attached from Mr. Bent.
16
     A memo from the government. And I know I read a letter
17
     also, I think, from Mr. Bent's mother. Was that attached to
18
     the, the supplemental filing or was that, where did I find
     that Miss Greenless?
19
20
               MS. GREENLESS: So there were several letters of
21
     support attached as exhibits.
2.2
               THE COURT:
                           To your sentencing memo?
23
              MS. GREENLESS: Yes, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT:
                           That's where I had to have read it.
25
               MS. GREENLESS: And then also a few evidentiary
```

```
exhibits.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: I think, did I get everything from
 3
    both sides, the two memos?
 4
               MR. DRESCHER: I believe so, yes.
 5
               THE COURT: Sometimes things come in at the last
 6
    minute. And I just wanted to make sure.
 7
               The other thing that I can say initially is that
     I'll accept the 11(c)(1)(C) agreement from both sides to cap
 8
     the sentence at nine years. I appreciate the efforts that
 9
10
     you both made in reaching that understanding.
11
               I know that both sides are free to argue for
12
     sentences at or below that level. It's a serious case.
13
     I didn't think, and I appreciate the government's being very
14
     straight up about it, I think the government appreciated as
15
     well, it probably wasn't a 14 year case. So I think the
16
     nine year cap is appropriate under the circumstances, an
17
     appropriate place to begin the discussions.
18
              Mr. Bent, a couple questions for you. Did you
19
    have an opportunity to read the Pre-Sentence Report?
20
               MR. BENT: Yes, I have, Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Did you also have a chance to go over
22
     it in private with your attorney, Miss Greenless?
23
               MR. BENT: Yes, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Was she able to answer any questions
25
     that you had about it?
```

1 MR. BENT: She was. 2 THE COURT: Okay. And, Miss Greenless, are there 3 objections to the Pre-Sentence Report which remains after 4 your discussions with the probation office that the Court 5 needs to resolve? 6 MS. GREENLESS: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Why don't we take them up one at a time. 8 MS. GREENLESS: Would you like me to begin? 9 10 THE COURT: Sure. Mr. Bent, you can probably have 11 a seat. And I'll turn things over to your lawyer. 12 MS. GREENLESS: So our first objection relates to 13 the drug quantity found in the PSR and base offense level of 14 26. So the PSR arrived at the base offense level 26 with a 15 458 kilogram converted drug weight. A hundred and 56 of 16 that was from converted drug weight that was from a seized 17 net quantity, seized between March 2018, approximately 18 March 13th to April 9th. 19 So our argument is that the -- so there's evidence 20 or the estimate was based on -- the first evidence of any 21 drug, other than marijuana being sold, would be January 18, 22 2018. And then this hundred and 56 net quantity converted 23 drug weight, multiplying that 156 kilograms by three. 24 So our argument is that there's no evidence that 25 actually supports that additional, it's 244 kilograms of

```
1
     converted drug weight, or an amount that could reach the 400
 2
     kilograms of converted drug weight to reach a base offense
 3
     level of 26.
 4
               THE COURT: So let me push back a little bit and
 5
    make sure I understand your position. No question about the
 6
     accuracy of the 156 --
 7
              MS. GREENLESS: No objection to that, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: -- kilos, right?
 9
               MS. GREENLESS:
                               Yes. It's the 244 kilograms
10
     converted drug weight approximation that we're objecting to.
11
     And even a quantity that could reach a base offense level of
12
     26.
13
               THE COURT: It would be two more months at the
14
    hundred and 56 kilogram rate?
15
              MS. GREENLESS: Two more months of distribution?
16
               THE COURT:
                           That's the PSR's position, right?
17
              MS. GREENLESS: Yes, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: 156 months for essentially a month,
19
     slightly less, but, and then two more periods of a hundred
20
     and 56 kilograms?
21
               MS. GREENLESS: Yes, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: So, and we know that the month, the
23
     converted drug weight wasn't the only product that was
24
    moved. So what would be --
25
               MS. GREENLESS: Yes, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: -- an alternative way of fairly computing that?

MS. GREENLESS: So I believe that the available evidence should be considered in approximating it. And the evidence is that Mr. Bent's statements to agents on, I believe, April 9th and 11th that he only had recently started selling the MDMA, LSD and cocaine, and that he predominantly sold cannabis.

Also in the attachments to our sentencing memo they show the actual dates that he listed MDMA, cocaine, LSD. The first time MDMA was listed was January 18th. It was taken down for sale on March 7th. So it was a limited time range that it was up prior to the investigation. That wouldn't equal two months of sale.

With cocaine, it was listed sometime after

January 19th, according to these listings, online listings.

And then it was taken down for sale on March 4th. So,

again, sold less than two months.

Then LSD, which would amount to the largest converted drug weight, was listed for the fires time, according to the evidence, on March 2nd. So for only 12 days prior to the start of the investigation when packages started to be seized.

And then also when Mr. Bent was being interviewed by agents he gave them access to his computer and all of his

marketplace accounts, spending accounts. And agents were 1 2 able to pull a 28 day history from that. And it shows what 3 he was selling and quantities. 4 So that can be used to average approximate 5 quantities sold of, our position is that they can be used to 6 approximate quantities sold for that limited period of time 7 that the -- so the 46 days the MDMA was sold prior to 8 March 13th. The four days the cocaine was sold. And only 9 12 days of LSD being sold. 10 THE COURT: What about the autumn of 2017 when we 11 know that financial transactions were occurring? We don't know much about the drug distribution. They would just be 12 sort of not taken into consideration? 13 14 MS. GREENLESS: Well, I would -- so I think that 15 they can be taken into consideration. But the only evidence 16 is that he was selling marijuana and hash. 17 THE COURT: Right. 18 MS. GREENLESS: And as I pointed out in the memo, 19 Mr. Bent's sentencing memo, if you approximate based on this 20 28 day history, including then the 156 kilograms that we 21

Mr. Bent's sentencing memo, if you approximate based on this 28 day history, including then the 156 kilograms that we don't object to, to reach a base offense level of 26, the 400 kilograms of converted drug weight, there would need to be evidence of a minimum of 111,000 grams of marijuana -- well, and then, excuse me. Let me back up.

So if you assume his cannabis sales were

22

23

24

25

50 percent hash, marijuana, because that roughly is what the evidence shows, there would need to be evidence of a minimum of a hundred thousand 11 grams of marijuana, 5,560 grams of hash to reach the necessary converted drug weight. And there just isn't evidence of that.

THE COURT: All right. While we're on this topic, why don't I ask the government about its objection to converted drug weight and then we can deal once and for all with the drug weight issue.

MR. DRESCHER: With regard to the drug weight, our initial position was that it should be higher than a base offense level of 26. I will withdraw that objection. And I'm prepared to defend the reasonableness of the base offense level of 26, the 400 to 700 kilograms of combined drug weight.

And there are several reasons why the PSR's, quite frankly, very thoughtful analysis should be the Court's conclusion with regard to drug weight.

As Your Honor and Ms. Greenless have recognized, we have 156 kilograms of combined drug weight in hand. That represents a snapshot of about a month. We know that the, Mr. Bent's drug sales dated back at least until October when he began his bitcoin laundering for drug proceeds, to which he's pleaded guilty.

So we have about a six month period of time when

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we know, by virtue of his guilty plea, and the undercover bitcoin sales or bitcoin exchange, that he had been involved in drug sales for six months. So some multiplier on top of the 156 is appropriate. I should emphasize that 156, the 156 kilograms of combined drug weight is what we have in hand. But I think it would be a mistake to conclude that that was a -- that that amount reflects everything that had happened during that month time period. I have provided the, Your Honor's courtroom deputy with two exhibits that I've shared with Miss Greenless. They are excerpts of Mr. Bent's post-arrest statement. And I would like to, with the Court's permission I would like to refer to these in making and arguing quantity. I don't -- I've shared them with Miss Greenless, I don't know if there's an objection to their use in this context. MS. GREENLESS: No objection. THE COURT: Appreciate it. So 1 and 2 are admitted for the purposes of the sentencing hearing. MR. DRESCHER: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm going to start with -- so there are two different exhibits because Mr. Bent was interviewed on two different days. I'd like to start with Exhibit 2, which is the first of his two interviews. And Mr. Bent admits at lines

nine and -- in the first substantive page of Exhibit 2 is

page 93 of that transcript. And at lines -- the first half of that page Mr. Bent is talking about the shipping of packages and his cousin's role in that.

And Mr. Bent says, beginning at line nine, I mean sometimes I have 20 or 30 of them going out, meaning packages, containing his drugs, in one day.

Now, we have about 90 parcels seized in the course of just one month. And that would be a small fraction of this range of shipping.

The other part of Exhibit 2 I'd like to emphasize is a different page of the transcript. It's page 61 of the transcript, but the third page of the exhibit.

And at this point in the interview Mr. Bent admits to having done approximately 500 dark web drug transactions on the Dream Dark Web Marketplace.

And then he estimates that all of his transactions on the other marketplaces were double digits, not triple digits. So he himself admits to at least 500 transactions on one marketplace alone and then some unspecified quantity on the other marketplaces.

The PSR lists what those other marketplaces consisted of at page 14. And they are numerous. There's the Hansa Marketplace, the Traderoute Marketplace, there's Arrow, Berlusconi, Wall Street, Zion, Sorcery and others.

So there are a number of -- that's at paragraph 14

of the PSR. We don't know how many transactions there were from those others, but he admits that there were others. So we have about 90 transactions in hand.

He admits to some quantity of drug transactions that is a significant multiple of 90. More than five times the 90 we have in hand. And that's based upon his admissions to law enforcement.

Those, you know, I think that would be a reasonable basis for the Court to multiply the 156 by five to get to an amount even above 400 to 700. In the interest of being conservative, I'm only trying to defend the PSR at this point.

Finally, with regard to Exhibit 1, which is a part of the interview that, Mr. Bent's second interview that followed the search of his residence in April of 2018, he's asked at the bottom of the second page of the exhibit, page 98 of the transcript, how much cash was sent to you? He was being asked about how he liquidated his bitcoin drug sale proceeds. And he explained that he was using the online dark web cash exchange or who went by the moniker of Gold. And he states, beginning at line 24 of page 98, the biggest, the biggest cash out I ever did was \$3,000 and that was about three months ago.

I emphasize that because we know, by virtue of Mr. Bent's guilty plea, and the evidence, that he actually

had a \$10,000 cash out using that online, online bitcoin exchanger as alleged in the money laundering, one of the money laundering counts.

So on top of his admissions to having had at least 500 drug transactions, and on top of his admissions that he would send out 20 to 30 packages a day at times, we also can conclude he was also minimizing at the same time he was making those admissions.

Again, that would give the Court an extra basis for concluding it's reasonable to multiply the drugs, the 156 kilograms we have in hand.

And then on top of that, he was, at the time of the search of Mr. Bent's residence, there was an additional approximately \$6,000 of bitcoin that he at that point possessed in his bitcoin wallet that had been seized and it's been administratively forfeited, which is further evidence of drug dealing that is, that is, that should be considered.

THE COURT: All right. Miss Greenless, anything else to add on that issue?

MS. GREENLESS: Yeah, if I could just respond to a couple things. So, Mr. Drescher, he mentioned six months of sales. However, I don't, based on the evidence I don't believe that's correct. Prior to 2018 he admitted to agents that he was, he was a vender on Hansa, a dark net

marketplace. However, Hansa was taken down in July 2017 based on evidence produced by the government.

2.2

And Mr. Bent told agents that he did not thereafter get back on a vender account on a dark net marketplace until 20 -- several months later, I believe early 2018, late 2017. So I, without, without any evidence of him actually distributing or on a vender account for six months I, I don't think the Court can find that.

And as far as all the vender accounts that the government mentioned in paragraph 14 of the PSR it does list multiple accounts, but it also states that the vender was solely on the Dream Marketplace. So he was vending solely on the Dream Market, not on all these other accounts.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I'm going to deny the objection. I think that the drug quantity calculation is fair. Nobody contests the calculation with respect to the 156 kilos of converted drug quantity.

The question is how to fairly estimate the additional trafficking. Djeneba Bent reported that she started to help out by mailing packages in January, two months before Mr. Bent was uncovered, and worked for a total of about three months.

I think the -- using the base of 156 kilos, and adding two months more of trafficking, likely understates the full scope of the operation, very much for the reasons

```
that Mr. Drescher has identified. It doesn't account for
 1
 2
     sales before January of 2018. It doesn't account for sales
 3
     during the 156-kilo period that slipped through the, slipped
 4
     through the net and weren't included. And it seems to
 5
     article fairly for the most active period of sales when Sam
 6
     and Djeneba Bent were working together in the first three
 7
    months of 2018.
               So I think it is always in these cases an estimate
 8
     based on imperfect information. That's the nature of the
 9
10
    process. But I think this is a fair estimate, conservative
11
     in the sense that it, if there's error in it it probably is
12
    most likely in favor of the defendant. So I don't think it
13
     overstates the drug quantity.
14
               Other objections?
15
              MS. GREENLESS: The firearm enhancement, Your
16
     Honor.
17
               THE COURT:
                           Right.
18
               MS. GREENLESS: So I believe our sentencing memo,
19
     it meets the clearly improbable standard to avoid the
20
     enhancement. Evidence shows that the rifle as found in
21
     Tracy Baker's bedroom, who he was sharing a residence with
22
     at the time of the April 9th search. Not Sam's bedroom.
23
     Sam and Miss Baker had broken up several months prior to the
24
     search. And he had been sleeping either on the couch or in
25
    his son's bedroom.
```

1.3

The rifle was registered in Miss Baker's name.

There's no evidence of anyone observing Mr. Bent with the firearm or believing he possessed a firearm.

The rifle was not in close proximity to any drugs found in the residence by agents. The majority of the drugs were obtained in a locked safe in a separate room, with the exception of some, I believe, marijuana that was stored in a freezer.

The rifle was found with an attached bayonet, which indicates it was more of a collectable item. And this might be an assumption, but if a rifle is being used for protection of drug proceeds and profits it would not make sense to attach a bayonet on it. It would seem to get in the way, if anything.

And then also I don't believe that it's -- the rifle is clearly connected to the offense here given the nature of the drug distribution here. It was all done online in a virtual location where buyers and sellers -- well sellers, venders, their identities protected by the anonymous nature of the dark net and crypto currency. Venders do not meet face to face with their buyers or their suppliers.

And the packages being sent out also included fake addresses. So the risk of violence here, or need for possessing a gun, is not present. So the, I don't believe

the policy underlying the enhancement, which, you know, recognizing the increased risk of danger when guns are possessed in drug trafficking is applicable here.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Drescher?

MR. DRESCHER: Certainly the guideline and the commentary to the guidelines create a sort of presumption that once the firearm is found that there has to be some really compelling evidence that it's unrelated to the drug offense. I think that is not the case here.

It was a loaded assault rifle. It was in the residence that Mr. Bent was maintaining for the purposes of drug distribution and drug storage. In the same residence of the assault rifle there were over 700 LSD doses, about, over a hundred and 40 gross weight grams of hash. More than 20 grams net weight of MDMA. More than 16 pounds of marijuana. A quantity of mushrooms. A quantity of cocaine. And that's just a recipe for problems having a loaded gun in the vicinity of distribution, of distribution inventory of drugs.

Miss Greenless has argued that because Mr. Bent's drug distribution was an online enterprise that that should somehow disconnect the gun from the drug operation. And I don't think that makes sense in light of the fact that this is the same residence where the inventory was being kept, the same residence where the packaging was occurring. And

the guidelines create the enhancement because of the dangerous mix of guns and drugs.

On top of that Mr. Bent was aware that he was prohibited from possessing a gun. And for him to, for him to indulge the presence of a loaded gun in the same house, on top of the drug operation, just doesn't add up. We think the firearm enhancement should apply.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection and remove the firearm enhancement. The firearm belonged to somebody else. It wasn't, as best we can tell, in close proximity to where Mr. Bent stayed in the house because he and the gun's owner were estranged, at least romantically.

The more critical reason I think is that the secrecy and anonymity of the operation made it unlikely that a firearm would be a part of the criminal activity.

As I understand how it worked, Mr. Bent never met his suppliers because he met them anonymously on the web. And they didn't want to know who he was and he didn't want to know who they were. And then, similarly, on the sales side, he sold anonymously and took considerable measures to conceal his whereabouts by driving to various post office boxes and using fake return addresses so that a disgruntled purchaser wouldn't know how to find him.

So the nature of the dark web transaction makes it extremely unlikely that there would be the sort of

```
confrontation that we would associate with a sales of drugs
 1
 2
     out of a known location like a, like a crack house or an
 3
     apartment.
 4
               So I think the way it was set up makes it unlikely
 5
     that somebody else's gun in a different part of the house
 6
     was, is fairly attributed to this operation.
 7
               Any other objections?
               MS. GREENLESS: No, Your Honor, other than
 8
 9
     adjusting the total offense level based on the firearm
10
     enhancement being removed.
11
                           Yes. That would bring the final
               THE COURT:
12
     offense level from 35 down to 33. And the range from 135 to
13
     168 months. Is that how you see it as well?
14
               MR. DRESCHER: It is.
15
               THE COURT: And it's still in excess of the
16
     stipulated sentencing range under 11(c)(1)(C) agreement, but
17
     it's independently necessary and important that the
18
     quidelines be calculated fairly.
19
               So any other objections that I need to decide?
20
               MS. GREENLESS: No, Your Honor.
21
                           There were a couple others that were
               THE COURT:
22
     raised in the report. And are those waived?
23
               MS. GREENLESS: Yes, Your Honor. They all related
24
     to -- aside from the firearm objection, they related to drug
25
     quantity.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Mr. Drescher, any further THE COURT: objections that I need to take up from the government's side? MR. DRESCHER: No. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. Appreciate it. At the end of the hearing, Mr. Bent, I'll put formal findings on the record which address the guidelines calculations adjusted as we've discussed. And I'll also speak more broadly about the statutory sentencing factors under the law that guide the Court in all cases, and, in particular, cases like this one which involve a request from both sides for a variance downward from the guidelines. But I'll turn things over to you and Miss Greenless. I'd be glad to hear from you both in whatever order and in any way you wish to present on the sentencing issues. MS. GREENLESS: Thank you, Your Honor. Bent is requesting a downward variance from the guideline range and from what's set forth in the plea agreement, the cap. However, he has reconsidered his position in the sentencing memorandum as far as an appropriate sentence and believes that no more than four years would be appropriate here and based on Section 3553 factors. Mr. Bent, he acknowledges the aggravating factors here, the seriousness of the crime that he committed and the

harmful effect of bringing drugs into communities. But there are aggravating factors here or, excuse me, mitigating factors here that the Court should be aware of, including, first, the very difficult and traumatic childhood he had.

His mother and he moved out of their home with their father at a very young age due to the father's cocaine use and physical abuse of his mother. Starting at the age of just nine years old he was physically abused by his stepfather for several years. So much so that his injuries put him into the hospital on more than one occasion.

He was kicked out of his mother's home around 16 years old and left to care for himself for those young years.

So I think his childhood helps one understand the criminal, the criminal activity that he got involved in his teenage years that led to the convictions that are set forth in his criminal history.

But after that, after those convictions, for the approximately 11 years leading up to instant offense, he did very well. And he didn't run into any trouble until he broke up with his girlfriend, Tracy Baker. He and his girlfriend broke up in 2017. And he made the mistake of turning to drug distribution on the dark net to make some money to move out and independently support himself and his son.

1.3

And he acknowledges the wrongness of that. And that is shown by his extraordinary acceptance of responsibility. From day one he cooperated and helped law enforcement. He met with them voluntarily on two occasions sharing incriminating and detailed information about the drug distribution involved. He shared information about in-coming packages of narcotics. He gave consent to search these packages. He gave agents access to his computers, all of his dark net accounts, his bitcoin wallet, his passwords. Much of the discovery comes from that in this case.

He also spent a large amount of time educating agents on how the dark net works and how the vending on the dark web works. And for his May 31 arrest he voluntarily surrendered.

And since his arrest, and the April 19, April 9th search, he's done very well. He's turned his life around, in fact. He has had no violations of conditions while on pre-trial release. He's been employed for 11 of 13 months he's been out on release. And for those two months he wasn't, the PSR states that he was actively searching for employment.

He, since March 2019, he's been at a supervisor role at his job and has received very high employer reviews. And also he's been financially supporting his wife, her daughter and his son since his arrest.

And I don't believe that any more than four years of incarceration is necessary for rehabilitation here. He's a smart and motivated guy. You'll see when he speaks to you. He's got plans to get his degree in business and open up his own computer consulting business, use his skills for good.

And also there's already been a couple aspects of punishment involved here, including the \$6,000 in bitcoin forfeiture and a \$14,000 criminal judgment in the plea agreement. So we believe that those mitigating factors support a downward variance here.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Bent, how do you see things?

MR. BENT: Um, I made a really bad decision. My decision, you know, the whole purpose of me doing it was so that I could get away from the situation I was in as far as living with my ex. And it actually, you know, did the opposite because now I'm going to be taken away from them.

And looking back on it, it was a foolish thing to do. I could have just as easily started a legitimate business and done it that way.

THE COURT: If I can interrupt, it can't be an easy thing to figure out how to do?

MR. BENT: So prior to that I actually, I have, I own a computer consulting business. It's called Worldwide

Computer Consultants. It's a licensed LLC here in Vermont. 1 2 So I had, I had the ability to do that in the past. Um, 3 moving out to East Burke it's a lot more rural. There 4 wasn't that much clients out there. And the internet was 5 much slower. So I couldn't do remote desktop support with 6 some of the clients that I had had in the past. So I lost 7 them. And my want to get out of the situation made me do 8 9 something that is very foolish at the end of the day. 10 hadn't um, I hadn't had a job for a while prior to that. 11 And living in the rural area there wasn't a lot of options 12 out there. Not that I'm saying that this was one. 13 Obviously, it wasn't. 14 And, you know, it was a very serious crime. 15 it's, it's something that, you know, it's going to take its 16 toll, not just on me, because what I did I deserve whatever 17 punishment I get. But, you know, also my family. And I 18 think that's one of the worst parts of it, is how it will 19 affect them. Because 10 years prior to that I spent taking

care of them. And now that's not an option because of what I did.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Aside from that, and then to change that and to change the course of my future I've already secured employment for whenever I get out. My current job will have me back whenever I get out. And um, I'm looking to get a

```
1
     business degree while I'm in there. Adam State University
 2
     allows for correspondence courses. So I'm going to use the
 3
     intelligence that I do have for good. You know, my computer
 4
     skills, I can still use them. But, again, you know, in a
 5
     responsible and legal manner that benefits society as
 6
     opposed to corrupting it like I was.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. That's a very fair
 8
     statement. Thank you.
 9
               MR. BENT:
                         Thank you, sir.
10
               THE COURT: Mr. Drescher, how does the government
11
     see things?
12
               MS. GREENLESS: Slightly differently than the
13
     defense, as to be expected. Miss Greenless and Mr. Bent
14
    have suggested a four year sentence strikes the right
15
     balance. We think a sentence substantially longer would
16
     strike the right balance for a handful of reasons.
17
               There are some mitigators here, or, I'm sorry,
18
     there are some aggravators here that I think are close to
19
     unique. First and foremost is the sophisticated nature of
20
    how the crime was committed.
21
               Mr. Bent's operational security was impressive
22
    using the dark web, using encrypted communications, willing
23
     to pay a large premium in an effort to hide his drug
24
    proceeds from lawful scrutiny.
25
               And folks who deal in controlled substances in
```

1.3

this manner are much less likely to be caught than the people who are dealing drugs the old fashioned way. That being the case, I think the Court's sentence is -- it is especially important that the Court send a general deterrent message to people who might be considering entering into this type of drug dealing operation.

On top of that, it's clear that Mr. Bent's motive in the case was not to, was not to help him obtain drugs to which he was addicted. His motive was profit. Pure and simple. And the fact that he did not see his customers face to face I, appears to have created this feeling that the, that the crime might not be as serious or as dangerous. He didn't have to live with the externalities, the costs of his drug dealing because he wasn't selling drugs to the people on the street block where he lived. But that doesn't make the drug dealing any less serious. And he was dealing very serious drugs to include LSD and cocaine.

There are some mitigators, to be sure. We think the nine year cap reflects most of the those. I'll comment on only one that was mentioned a moment ago. And that is, Mr. Bent did give interviews to law enforcement on the day of the search of his residence and a couple days later.

As I pointed out, earlier in the day there was some minimization in those, in those interviews. There was some suggestion that he, like, made available to law

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

enforcement his passwords. Well, as I understand what happened, when the search was executed the computer was up and running. And law enforcement had access to his computer as they entered into his residence. So it's, the fact that law enforcement was able to identify what, what dark web marketplaces he had passwords for, what dark web marketplaces he had accounts up on, I don't think is something that Mr. Bent should be credited for because of the way the operation played out. Having said that, Mr. Bent did sit down with law enforcement and did provide some background information about what his conduct had been. And for that he does deserve some credit. But we think that credit is in the form of the plea agreement that he's entered into already. So our recommendation is that the right sentence is one that approaches nine years that will send an appropriate general deterrent message without being longer than necessary to strike the right balance of the other factors in Section 3553(a). THE COURT: All right. Thank you both. Can you remind me, Mr. Drescher, how the forfeiture works so that I have that in mind? MR. DRESCHER: So there's -- the plea calls for

the judgment to include, the sentence to include a

forfeiture money judgment in the amount of \$14,000. It's my

```
understanding, I'll confess, I didn't review the rule coming
 1
 2
     into court today, but it's my understanding that it's, to
 3
     comply with the rule, the Court's judgment, as it announces
 4
     sentence today, should -- the Court should take care to
 5
     include on the record that the sentence will include a
 6
     forfeiture money judgment in that amount.
 7
               THE COURT: And there's a separate seizure of
 8
     $6,000 which I don't need to be concerned with?
 9
               MR. DRESCHER: That's correct.
10
               THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough. Thanks.
11
               The next thing for me to do is to read the
12
     guidelines findings into the record so they have a permanent
1.3
    place in the proceeding. I'll do that. I've adjusted them
14
     to reflect the removal of the gun enhancement. They are
15
     otherwise as the parties have seen them with their prior
16
     discussions with the probation office.
17
               MS. GREENLESS: Your Honor? Sorry. I apologize
18
     to interrupt. One thing I should have added earlier when
19
     you mentioned any other objections to the PSR, not an
20
     objection, but it mentions six open warrants in
2.1
    Massachusetts.
22
               THE COURT:
                           Right.
23
               MS. GREENLESS: Those have all been resolved.
24
     I'm wondering if the Court can issue an order that it be
25
    modified to state so, the PSR be modified.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yeah. I spoke before with the THE COURT: probation office. And I recognize most were resolved. think there are two left, but I'll defer to the probation office. PROBATION OFFICERE: All six warrants have been resolved, Your Honor. There are two hearings scheduled. One is a violation of probation sentencing. And one is a pre-trial conference. But all the warrants have been resolved. THE COURT: So it's easily done to adjust that in the PSR? PROBATION OFFICERE: Yes. THE COURT: That's fair. Because certainly I wouldn't want the Bureau of Prisons to think at the end of a sentence there were warrants waiting. Yeah. Thanks. We'll do that. Statement of reasons for sentence: Pursuant to the decisions of the Supreme Court in United States versus Booker and Gall versus United States, and the Second Circuit's Court of Appeals decision in United States versus Crosby, in determining the following sentence the Court has considered the United States Sentencing Guidelines applicable in this case, including all departure authority contained in the quidelines policy statements as well as all

of the factors enumerated in 18 U.S.C., Section 3553(a).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Court finds as follows in this case: One, the offense of conspiracy to distribute controlled substances, in violation of 21 U.S.C., Sections 846, 841(a), 841(b)(1)(C), occurred between August 2017 and April 2018. The offenses of money laundering, in violation of 18 U.S.C., Sections 1956(a)(1)(B)(1), occurred on or about September 28, 2017, October 10, 2017 and January 16th, 2018. Hence, the sentencing guidelines apply in this case. Two, counts one, seven, eight, nine group pursuant to Guideline Section 3D1.2(c). Three, the guideline for this group is found in Section 2S1.1 of the Guidelines Manual, the November 1, 2018 edition. Pursuant to Guideline Section 2S1.1, the underlying offense guideline, in this case Section 2D1.1, is referenced when determining the base offense level. A., the offense involved between 400 and 700 kilograms of converted drug weight. Therefore, the offense level is 26. B., the defendant distributed controlled substances through mass marketing, resulting in an increase of two levels pursuant to 2D1.1(b)(7). D., the defendant maintained a premises for the purpose of storing, manufacturing, or distributing a controlled substance, resulting in an increase of two levels

pursuant to Guideline Section 2D1.1(b)(12). 1 2 E., the defendant receives an aggravating role 3 adjustment and was directly involved in the importation of a 4 controlled substance, resulting in an increase of two levels 5 pursuant to Guideline Section 2D1.1(b)(16)(C). The total 6 base offense level is 32. 7 Four, specific offense characteristics under 8 Guideline Section 2S1.1 apply. A., the defendant was convicted of 18 U.S.C., 9 10 Section 1956, therefore the offense level is increased by 11 two levels. The adjusted offense level becomes 34. 12 Five, the defendant was an organizer, leader, 13 manager, or supervisor of the criminal activity, resulting 14 in an increase of two levels. The adjusted offense level is 15 36. 16 Six, the defendant has demonstrated an acceptance 17 of responsibility for his offense, therefore his offense 18 level is reduced by three levels pursuant to Guideline Section 3E1.1. The total offense level is 33. 19 20 The defendant has zero criminal history points, 21 resulting in a criminal history category of I. The 22 quideline range of imprisonment for an offense level of 33 23 and a criminal history category of I is 135 to 168 months.

Eight, the guideline term of supervised release is

three years on count one and one to three years on counts

24

25

seven, eight and nine. Since the applicable guideline is in Zone D of the sentencing table, imposition of a term of probation is not authorized.

I'll turn from the guideline calculations to the broader statutory sentencing factors. I've considered these factors in seeking to reach a sentencing decision which is sufficient, but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of the sentence. I've considered the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the crime, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense. The sentence should also deter criminal conduct and protect the public from future crime by the defendant and promote rehabilitation.

Let me talk as candidly and directly as I can,
Mr. Bent, with you about the factors under Section 3553.

They are critical to the sentencing decision in this case
because it's not going to be a guideline sentence. Both
parties have agreed to that. And so the broader sentencing
factors are really what guide me.

First, the nature and circumstances of the offense. The offense is a very serious offense. I think everyone here recognizes that on both sides. I certainly do. As I understand your conduct, you started off selling marijuana over the web in sort of a complex computer structure and moved quickly to selling many other drugs more

harmful, more dangerous. And I think what's very fortunate that the agents, through the sting operation, were able to catch you because I think this was simply going to increase in the variety and dangerousness of drugs. And I'm not sure that, as you did that, you had a full appreciation of the harm that drugs like LSD and cocaine can cause to people, particularly young people who I surmise are most likely to find you on the dark web.

So it's a serious offense. And I think it was kind of increasing in seriousness as time, as time went on. And that's demonstrated by the involvement of your cousin and your use of her to mail increasing numbers of packages from local post offices.

History and characteristics of the defendant.

I'll do my best to speak frankly about the positives and the negatives. The negative is, we've already really talked about. You are willing to sell dangerous drugs to strangers all over the United States, whose ages and vulnerabilities you had no way of appreciating, to make cash. That's a bad thing.

On the good side, and on the mitigating side, I recognize that you have no criminal history for purposes of the guideline calculations. That you came out of a difficult family setting. That in your teenage years you were not an easy law abiding type of young man and that you

1.3

2.2

changed that behavior and became a responsible person. A father, a wage earner, a person with considerable intellectual gifts, particularly in the area of computers, and that you really overcame a difficult start in life.

And I listened and I understood when you spoke today about your determination to return to that path. And I have real confidence that you mean it and that you can do it. And that you have family support here today, and that they will stay with you. Your children stay with you regardless, and I trust your spouse will as well.

So history and characteristics, looking forward, I would say there's reason for optimism. And I've taken that into consideration in thinking about a sentence.

In many cases I don't talk much about deterrence.

Deterrence means trying to make sure that these crimes don't happen again. It has two aspects. You know, one is deterring you as an individual. I think probably your arrest accomplished most of that.

MR. BENT: It did, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I here yeah. I don't think there's any likelihood that you're going to return. But there are other young men and women in this sort of hacking and computer savey world who can figure out, like you, how to kind of open the next lands end cite for the sale of drugs.

And it's a sort of ingenious crime because all you need is a

computer. You don't need to know people who are selling drugs because they are, as I understand it, online, and you don't need to know your customers because they are online. It's a crime which could be repeated by, you know, by another young person with similar skills and a willingness to let their moral code down.

So I think there is a need to impose a sentence which will resonate with other people who are thinking about this. And I've thought a lot about, this week about where that range for such a sentence would be strong enough to deter others and not unduly punitive in your individual case. It's a problem.

The need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among similarly situated defendants means that we try to treat people evenly for similar conduct, not play favorites in court. And most of the drug distribution defendants whom we see are involved in, all of them I think except, except for you were involved in more hand to hand traditional drug distribution. And their sentences, when there are not aggravating circumstances with violence or things of that nature, have frequently fallen in the range which the parties have been discussing, about four years, below nine. I think both sides of the Court are all sort of, tried to be consistent in treating, in imposing sentences which reflect a serious attempt to respond to the behavior without kind of

ending adult life as you know it. Leaving room for you and time to recover and move onto a better manner of life.

1.3

The type of sentences available. An incarcerative sentence is my only choice. I think a probation sentence is not appropriate. Nobody has advocated for it.

 $\label{eq:solution} \text{So I tried to explain my thinking as best I can.}$ I'll impose the sentence.

The sentence of the Court is that the defendant is committed to the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for a term of 60 months on counts one, seven, eight, nine, all concurrent. That means it's a five year sentence. It runs at the same time on each count. For a total sentence of 60 months. To be followed by a three year term of supervised release.

And the conditions of supervised release are as follows: A., you must not commit another federal, state or local crime.

B., you must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance.

C., you must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. You must submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment or placement on probation and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the Court.

D., you must cooperate in the collection of DNA as

directed by the probation officer.

2.2

E., you must comply with the standard conditions of supervision set forth in Part G of the Pre-Sentence Report. These conditions are imposed because they establish the basic expectations for your behavior while on supervision and identify the minimum tools needed by probation officers to keep informed, report to the Court about, and bring about improvements in your conduct and condition.

F., you must submit your person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, computers, other electronic communications or data storage devices or media, or office, to a search conducted by a United States Probation Officer. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release.

You must warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. An officer may conduct a search pursuant to this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that you have violated a condition of supervision and that the areas to be searched contain evidence of this violation. Any search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

I'll state for the record that the sentence is a variance down from the guideline range of 135 to 168 months.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The principal basis for the variance is the lack of criminal record. Of course, that's reflected in the guideline calculation as well. But in this case, I think it counts in your favor that you overcame childhood difficulties, which were not of your causing, obviously, and a difficult youth, teenage years. And with the exception of this serious offense, through your own efforts, have made yourself a good citizen and a good member of our society. And I think that absence of other criminal conduct, and your significant family responsibilities now with children, and your difficult beginnings are a strong reason to vary below the guideline range. The guideline fine range is from \$40,000 to \$2,500,000. The defendant has demonstrated no ability to pay a fine, therefore all fines are waived. A special assessment of \$400 is due immediately. And I will state for the record that the Court will impose the agreed upon forfeiture money judgment in the amount of \$14,000. I'll ask Mr. Drescher to submit the form of an order and I will sign it upon receipt. MR. DRESCHER: Very well. Will do. THE COURT: All right. Thanks. You have appeal rights, I'll read them aloud. Both the defendant and the government may have the right to appeal this sentence, as set forth in Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 3742. If the

```
1
     defendant is unable to pay the cost of an appeal, he has the
 2
     right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, and
 3
     request the Court to appoint counsel for him.
 4
               If the defendant so requests, the clerk of the
 5
     court shall prepare and file forthwith a notice of appeal on
 6
    behalf of the defendant. Notice of appeal by the defendant
 7
    must be filed within 14 days of the date judgment is entered
     on the docket, pursuant to Rule 4(b) of the Federal Rules of
 8
 9
     Appellate Procedure.
10
               Miss Greenless, any request as to location?
11
               MS. GREENLESS: He would like to be as near to his
12
     family as possible.
                           That would probably be Berlin, New
13
               THE COURT:
     Hampshire. Is that a reasonable choice? I think there's a
14
15
     camp there too if he qualifies.
                         My understanding is that some of the
16
               MR. BENT:
17
     facilities have better educational options.
18
               THE COURT: I'm sure that's true. And I'll be
19
     glad to recommend anywhere that you've heard about.
20
                          I've already looked into it, Your
               MR. BENT:
21
            Danbury in Connecticut seems to have really good
22
    vocational training and things along those lines.
23
               THE COURT: All right. So I'll recommend
24
    placement at Danbury.
25
               Mr. Drescher, what is the government's view as to
```

```
self-surrender?
 1
 2
               MR. DRESCHER: In light of Mr. Bent's compliance
 3
     since his arraignment in this case we don't object to him
 4
    being allowed to self-surrender.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. You have a court date,
 6
     remind me, in Massachusetts. When is that?
 7
               MR. BENT: I believe it was in September. Um, I
    have it written down at home.
 8
               THE COURT: I think Miss Greenless knows
 9
10
               PROBATION OFFICERE: September 12th, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: September 12th. So, and you plan to
12
     keep that?
13
               MR. BENT: Um, so when I had my warrants removed
14
     the other day my lawyer had told me that he had gotten an
15
     amendment when -- so my presence was waived. So that the
16
     sentence would commence without me actually having to be
17
     there because the Court down there was aware that I was
18
     awaiting a federal sentence.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. So how about we
20
     give you 30 days to get your affairs in order?
21
               MR. BENT: Thank you, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Where would that bring us?
23
               THE CLERK: Self-report date would be Tuesday,
24
    October 1st before 2 p.m..
25
               THE COURT: The probation office can help you with
```

```
the details.
 1
               MR. BENT: Okay. Thank you.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Miss Greenless, anything else from
 4
     your side?
 5
               MS. GREENLESS: No, Your Honor.
                                                Thank you.
 6
               THE COURT: Mr. Drescher?
 7
               MR. DRESCHER: Your Honor, I move to dismiss the
     remaining counts of the indictment, which are counts two
 8
 9
     through six and count 10.
10
               THE COURT: Granted.
11
               I would just say this, Mr. Bent, I know it's not
12
     an easy day for you. But I look forward to welcoming you
13
    back to the community after you've completed your sentence.
14
     You are clearly a gifted person in many respects. And I
15
     look forward to, I'm not often in East Burke, but if you
16
     catch sight of me in Burlington I hope you'll march right up
17
     and say hello and introduce me to your son or your wife,
18
     whoever is with you. The time I really don't want to see
19
     you again would be back in a federal courtroom on a
20
     violation. I'm sure that's not going to be an issue.
21
                          That won't happen, Your Honor.
              MR. BENT:
22
               THE COURT: Okay. Fair. Good luck with things.
23
     Okay.
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
24
               MR. BENT:
25
                           Thank you both. I appreciate your
               THE COURT:
```

```
1
     help very much, both of you.
 2
               MR. DRESCHER: Thank you.
 3
               The Court recessed at 11:46 a.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Anne Marie Henry, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, for the District of Vermont, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my shorthand notes taken in the aforementioned matter to the best of my skill and ability.

Anne Marie Henry, RPR

Official Court Reporter